

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 19 and 30 are independent. In the Office Action dated July 11, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Paula for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 3, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. Furthermore, the Examiner indicated the currently amended claims appear to overcome the cited references, but that a further search is needed. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated July 11, 2008 the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 16-20, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Star Office 5.1 Memorandum ("*Staroffice*") in view of U.S. Pub. Patent App. No. 2004/0049294 A1 ("*Keene*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because combining *Staroffice* with *Keene* would not have led to the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter. Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein the removal of one or more pieces of personal information from the first document comprises the computer-implemented stage of replacing the one or more pieces of personal information created by the document-generating application with generic information visible at each comment block of the first document, wherein the generic information was not previously visible at each comment block of the first document, wherein the generic information was not previously visible at each comment block of the first document." Amended Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 11, line 28 – page 12, line 10 and page 18, lines 5-26.

In contrast, *Staroffice* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Staroffice* discloses the functionality of an "apply user data" check box which appears as part of a properties dialog box for viewing and editing properties of StarWriter documents. (See *Staroffice*, memo) For example, in *StarOffice*, a user may select or deselect the "apply user data" check box. When the check box is enabled, the user's name is enabled to be displayed in the properties dialog box along with the document's creation and modification dates and times. (See *Staroffice*, memo, Screenshot No. 1) *Staroffice* provides that a user may deselect the "apply user data" check box and then select the "ok" button within the properties dialog box, which subsequently removes the properties dialog box from the screen. (See *Staroffice*, memo, Screenshot Nos. 1-2) If the document is then saved and the properties dialog

box is subsequently reopened, *Staroffice* discloses that the properties dialog box will display the identical information previously presented with the author's name removed.

In *Staroffice*, the author's name is not replaced with generic information not previously visible at each comment block of the first document. Rather, in *Staroffice*, an author's name may be hidden from view in a properties dialog box based on deselection of the "apply user data" box.

Furthermore, *Keene* does not overcome *Staroffice's* deficiencies. *Keene* merely discloses retrieving information pertaining to an individual user's privilege criteria and determining which information contained in a database may be accessed by a requestor. (See *Keene*, para. [0007].) In *Keene*, when a guest user requests access to an object, a retention system extracts the requestor's user ID. (See *Keene*, para. [0047].) The user ID in *Keene* is matched with predetermined privilege identifications allowing the retention system to send a version of the requested object which reveals information to which the guest user has privileged access. (See *Keene*, para. [0047].) Nowhere does *Keene* disclose removing personal information from a document without regard to verifying individual user privileges to view such personal information. Rather, the retention system in *Keene* maintains such personal information in the document for display to user's with privileges to see it.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine *Staroffice* and *Keene* because of the reasons found in *Keene*, including maintaining trade secrets, confidentiality among business partners, and allowing access to information in an organized and useful manner. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that removing personal information from both the file and memory representations of a document and

replacing said information with generic information visible at each comment block of the first document, wherein the generic information was not previously visible at each comment block of the first document provides additional utility not taught or disclosed by *Keene*.

Combining *Staroffice* with *Keene* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Staroffice* and *Keene*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "wherein the removal of one or more pieces of personal information from the first document comprises the computer-implemented stage of replacing the one or more pieces of personal information created by the document-generating application with generic information visible at each comment block of the first document, wherein the generic information was not previously visible at each comment block of the first document" as recited by Claim 1. Independent Claims 11, 19, and 30 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited references, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30.

Dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27-29 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 11, 19, and 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-18, 20, and 27-29.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit

that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: September 11, 2008

/D. Kent Stier/
D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ak